Supreme Court
FILED

01 274 AUG 13 2001

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Case No. 1 Docket No.

Case No. 2 Docket No.

In the United States Supreme Court

Ashok Kashelkar Case No. 1
Petitioner

-against-

Harold Y. MacCartney, Jr et al
Respondents

ASHOK KASHELKAR Case No. 2
Petitioner

-against-

RUBIN & ROTHMAN ; et al
Respondents

On Petition For Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court for the Second Circuit

Appendix F - Conforming to Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Petitioner - Ashok Kashelkar - Pro Se
6 Innington Court,
Spring Valley, NY 10977
Tel. (845) 426 2902

Table Of Contents

List of the Counsels for the Respondents ii

Statement Of Petitioner iii

Motion Form- dated July 02, 2001 submitted to the Court Of Appeals for the Second Circuits and the Decision of the Court, dated July 12, 2001 1

Petitioner's affidavit, dated July 02, 2001, submitted to the Second Circuit requesting "vacation" of the Mandate 2-3

List Of Exhibits-referred to in the Affidavit-above and their reference, in Appendixes B & C, herein 17

U. S. Post Office Cash Receipt for 03-09-01 19

and the receipt from Kinko-copies made, on March 08, 2001, at 11.32 PM

U. S. Postal Service- Delivery Confirmation Receipt-showing-my depositing mail, on March 09, 2001 20

Copy of the CA2NY envelope-showing Franking Meter Impression for Postage paid-March 12, 2001 21

List of the Counsels for the Respondents

Case No. 1... Ashok Kashelkar v
Harold Y. MacCartney, Jr, et al

MacCartney, MacCartney, Kerrigan &MacCartney,
For Harold Y. MacCartney, Jr and the Firm
13 North Broadway
Nyack, NY 10960
Tel (845) 358 0074

Garcia & Stallone ESQ
For: Debora J. Dillon, William R. Watson;
O'Connor, McGuiness, Conte, Doyle,
Olsen & Collins
135 Pine Lawn Road- Suite 220 N
Melville NY 11747
Tel (631) 249 6644

Attorney General O The State Of New York
Charles F. Sanders. Asst. Atty Gen
For Bruce Muldoon
120 Broadway, New York 10271
Tel (212) 416 8594

Case No. 2 Ashok Kashelkar v Rubin & Rothman, et al

Cahill, Gordon & Reindel
Joseph Gershman
80 Pine Street, New York NY 10005
Tel (212) 701 3000

Statement Of Petitioner

Ashok Kashelkar, petitioner herein, respectfully states, that, the within "unusual nature of record" in The Court Of Appeals, for the Second Circuit throws "substantial light" upon the "peculiar method adopted by the Federal Judges [Courts] and by the staff members, particularly in the Court Of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This petition is submitted in conformance with U. S. Supreme Court Rule 12.4, in view of the "substantially same and\or similar" questions presented in the Petition and the issues have been raised in the lower Court.

This Appendix, is a "combined" Appendix, for the two cases covered by this Petition.

Spring Valley, NY

Dated July 30, 2001

Ashok Kashelkar
Pro Se Petitioner
6 Innington Court
Spring Valley NY 10977
Tel. (845) 426 2902

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Docket Number: 00-7090

Ashok Kashelkar
Plaintiff\Appellant
Harold Y. MacCartney, Jr. et al
Defendants\Appellees

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
Filed July 05, 2001
ROSEANN B. MacKECHNIE, Clerk
SECOND CIRCUIT

Motion for: Vacate \ Stay Mandate

MOTION BY:
Ashok Kashelkar Pro Se
6 Innington Court, Spring Valley NY 10977

OPPOSING COUNSEL:
Please see attached list
Has consent of opposing counsel:

A. been sought? __Yes _x_ No
B . been obtained? __ Yes _x_No
Has service been effected? _x_Yes __ No

Judge or agency whose order is being appealed:
Decision, Order & Judgement of U. S. District Court, SDNY McMahon-J, under appeals and the subsequent decisions/ Orders of this Court.

Brief statement of the relief requested: This motion seeks order to "vacate" the Mandate of March 09, 2001, on account of the fact, it has been issued in violations of FRAP Rules (including Local Rule) and for more important reason, that this appellant is proceeding to file Petition for Certiorari, in the U. S. Supreme Court, on Constitutional Grounds.

Sd _____

By: Ashok Kashelkar

Appearing for: (Name of Party) Pro Se

Appellant _x_ Plaintiff_

Date: July 02, 2001

ORDER

Before: Hon. Amalya L. Kearse, Hon. Pierre N. Leval, Hon. Sonia Sotomayor Circuit Judges

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion be and it hereby is **DENIED.**

Date: July 12, 2001

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
Filed
July 12, 2001
ROSEANN B. MacKECHNIE, Clerk

For the Court:

ROSEANN B. MacKECHNIE, Clerk

By: Sd._____

Arthur M. Heller

Administrative Attorney

The following affidavit was submitted, with the preceding Motion Form

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT Docket No. 00-7090

----------x

AHSOK KASHELKAR

Plaintiff\Appellant

Affidavit In Support of Motion

-against-

HAROLD Y. MacCARTNEY, JR, et al
Defendants \Respondents

----------x

County Of Rockland: State Of New York

ASHOK KASHELKAR, Plaintiff and Appellant, appearing and proceeding Pro Se, [but not an attorney] in the U. S. Court Of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit deposes and respectfully states as follows:

Objective of this motion is stated in para 1 & 2:

1) VACATE the Mandate of this Court, dated March 09, 2001, being unconstitutional.

2) Stay this Court's Mandate [if this (Court) is not willing to vacate it], dated March 09, 2001; on account of this Appellant's intention to file a petition to the United States Supreme Court, seeking writ of certiorari; on account of substantial constitutional questions. This Court, by it's "decision of May 30, 2001" has refused to accept the Petition for En Banc Hearing and rejected request to certify questions of Law to the U. S. Supreme Court.

BACKGROUND

3) I personally appeared before this Court for the oral arguments on the Appeal and the arguments were heard on November 01, 2001. During the arguments, and in support of the *"issues I raised, in my Appeals"*

to this Court, I openly read in the record of this Court, excerpts from *Hurtado v California* 110 US 526 and *Rochin v California* 342 US 165, referring to the Constitutional limitations on the Power of the Judicial Branch of the Government.

4) None of the Panel Members asked me any questions. At the conclusion of the arguments [from all sides] in this Court, Hon. Amalya Kearse, in the open Court announced that the Court, "reserves it's decision".

5) I received the "Summary Order" dated Nov. 07, 2000, on or about Nov. 09, 2001; affirming the district Court Judgement, substantially for the same reasons as the USDC, except a comment about proper application of "statute of time limitations" for Rico cases. The Summary order fails to discuss any issues "I have raised in my appeals" and also fails to even acknowledge that, I cited the extremely important two cases, limiting the "legal authority" of the Judiciary, decided by the U. S. Supreme Court, referred to in para 4.

6) Observing that the "Summary Order" is devoid of any issues I raised in my appeals and "arguments" I presented in open Court, I decided to file the Petition for Rehearing.

7) In view of the fact, I was leaving for India, as previously planned and could not complete the "Petition for Rehearing" in one day available to me, I requested this Court for extension of time and this Court extended time for me to file Petition for "rehearing", to Dec. 15, 2000,for which I am grateful to this Court. Pursuant to FRAP Rule 40 [that this

Court sent me with the "Summary Order"] , upon my return from India, on Nov. 27, 2000, I prepared and served my "Petition for Reargurnents" on Dec. 15, 2000.

8) Within the "Petition for Reargurnents", on Page 2, I requested this Court to refer the matter:

A: to the " En Banc U. S. Court Of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit",

B or "Certify the question" to the United States Supreme Court , for the purpose of "resolution".

9) In the "Petition for Rehearing" to this Court, I continued to raise issues relating to application of 18 USCS 1621 and 18 USCS 1623, to the Appellant \ defendant, resulting from the "perjuries" perpetrated by Defendant Harold Y. MacCartney, in the District Court proceeding.

10) My Appellate Brief, Reply brief and my "Petition for Rehearing" contains citations of 79 Cases decided by the United States Supreme Court, since 1803 [including Marbury v Madison 1 Cranch 137] and 12 Cases of the 2nd Circuit, in support of my appeal and I offered arguments within the available space, consistent with the limitations placed by the FRAP rules.

11) My timely filed "Petition for Rehearing", has been denied in the name of this Court, on Feb. 09, 2001; without any reasons as well as any "comments" upon my request, either for "certification" of any question

to the Supreme Court, nor about my request, to refer the matter for En Banc hearing. This denial is signed by Administrative Attorney Beth J. Meador. The same is attached as Exhibit..**Mo Ex 01.**

12) Upon receipt of the "denial" [Exhibit Mo. Ex 01] on Feb. 14, 2001; I served a Motion, to enlarge time to serve "Petition for En Banc Hearing", to March 09, 2001; on Feb. 17, 2001. This motion contains my "explicit statement" of my intention to "Request En Banc Hearing". The motion also contains "Good Cause of my request for time to work."

13) I did not receive any response from this Court, to my motion referred to in para 12, before I served my Petition for En Banc Hearing, on March 09, 2001.

Development Of Problems

14) The criteria for requesting "En Banc Hearing" is *that the panel decision conflict's with* **a single decision of the United States Supreme Court.** My appeals contain citations in support of my appeals, from dozens of cases, decided by the U. S. Supreme Court and hence this Court has been "on notice" of the contradictions, vis-a-vis it's decisions with those of the U. S. Supreme Court.

15) Based upon the FRAP Rules, I prepared and served my Petition for En Banc He, upon all parties, on March 09, 2001, **MO Ex 1-A.** Up to that time of my mailing the Petition for En Banc Hearing, I had not received any order of any nature from this Court.

16) On March 14, 2001; I received a decision, in the name

of this Court denying my motion to "enlarge time", that was placed in the mail on March 12, 2001 and but is dated March 09, 2001. This is attached hereto as my Exhibit **MO Ex 02.** This is signed by Administrative Attorney Arthur M. Heller.

17) The facts show, that the Court did not serve the decision [Mo. Ex 02] upon me, till March 12, 2001 by which time, my both petitions WERE received in the Court.

18) Concurrent with this matter, my Appeals under docket No. 00-7751, in this Court, in the matter of Ashok Kashelkar v Rubin & Rothman, et al, has also been pending before another panel of Judges. That appeal was heard in open Court on Dec. 20, 2000.

19) During the arguments, in the Rubin & Rothman matter [00-7751] the Panel Judges [including Hon. Judge Laval;] questioned me about *"basic facts"* and I responded to the questions. The questions "as posed", made it *abundantly clear* to me, that the Panel members were "surprised" to hear my arguments [as if they "did not have any knowledge of the facts of case under appeal"] and convinced me that, they were *"not at all familiar"* with the issues under appeal. I also read excerpts from some cases, decided by the U. S. Supreme Court. In fact Judge Jacob somewhat jovially questioned about, "how to find such money."

20) By it's decision, dated Jan. 02, 2001 the Panel headed by Hon. Judge Jacobs affirmed the District Court judgement. The decision of the panel failed to even acknowledge that

A) I offered any arguments in open Court,

B) that the Panel members asked me questions and that I *answered "panel member's questions"*,

C) in addition to which I read excerpts from some cases, decided by the U. S. Supreme Court and offered extensive comments. In my briefs.

21) On Jan. 15, 2001, I served and filed my Petition for Rehearing, in the 00-7751, matter.

22) Decision dated Feb. 09, 2001, under signature of Beth J. Meador denied my "Petition for Rehearing", in the 00-7751 matter. The denial in 00-7751 is attached as Exhibit **Mo Ex 03.**

23) I filed Motions dated Feb. 17, 2001 [similar to that in para 12 herein] in the Rubin & Rothman matter, to enlarge time to serve a petition for "En Banc Hearing" and contains my "explicit statement" of my intention to "Request En Banc Hearing". The motion also contains "Good Cause of my request for time to work." I did not get any response, from CA2NY regarding "this motion" before I served my Petition for En Banc Hearing, on March 09, 2001.

24) On March 09, 2001, I prepared, served and filed my "Petition for 'En banc Hearing' " on March 09, 2001; in the R&R matter, under docket No. 00-7751.

25) In short, I served and filed my "petitions for En Banc

Hearing" in both the matters on March 09, 2001 [CA2NY Docket Nos. 00-7090 and 00-7751] before I could get any response to my Motions of Feb. 17, 2001. Therefore, my Petition for En Banc Hearing was "timely filed" pursuant to the rules. Applicable rules discussed in *Mo. Ex. 10,* herein.

26) Along with the denial of my Motion in [00-7090] MacCartney matter, I received this Court's mandate, also dated March 09, 2001.

27) On March 16, 2001; I "served and filed" my Motion by U. S. Mail to "Reconsider, Modify or Vacate" the CA2NY "Decision of Denial and it's Mandate" and also requested "stay of enforcement of it's Mandate".

28) On March 24, 2001 I filed a supplemental motion in support of my motion of March 16, 2001. In my motions, I questioned

A) the reasons that the Denial was mailed on March 12, 2001-while it is dated March 09, 2001 and have claimed that, the denial was mailed after this Court received my Petition for En Banc Hearing.

B) Questioned the denial of my motion, that in fact is denial for my right to work-that is my basic right.

C) Questioned the authority for denial of such basic right, etc. I never received any response, from this Court, to my requests for clarifications.

D) And requested, that the "denial of the motion and fact for "my right work to earn living" be made under "authentic signatures" of the Judges of this Court.

29) By it's order of April 06, 2001, this Court granted my motion for leave to file the Petition for rehearing En Banc [in the Rubin & Rothman matter Docket 00-7751] and that it shall be determined by the full Court based on the petition. Copy of the Court order [CA2NY] is attached as **Mo Ex 04**.

30) On April 14, 2001 [that was Saturday], I received a letter from The Office Of The Clerk, CA2NY it's letter, dated April 06, 2001 but mailed on April 10, 2001; returning my "Supplemental Motion" of March 24, 2001; indicating that, *"the case is closed"*. The letter further notified me, that the Court may "impose penalty" for submitting any further papers, to the Court. Copy of the CA2NY letter of the Clerk, under signature of Beth J. Meador, dated April 06, 2001 is attached as **Mo Ex. 05.**

31) "Believing that the CA2NY [clerk's office] was improperly "closing my case", I wrote a letter to the Clerk on April 17, [Tuesday] 2001. Copy attached as **Mo. Ex 06.**

32) Under the signature of Ms. Beth J. Meador, administrative attorney, CA2NY Clerk's office responded, by April 26, 2001 letter. Copy attached as my **Mo. Ex 07.**

33) I wrote to Ms. Beth J. Meador on May 05, 2001 "disagreeing with her interpretations" and questioning

the action to close the file. Copy attached as **Mo. Ex. 08.**

34) CA2NY Clerk's office, under Beth J. Meador's letter of May 07, 2001 responded to my letter of May 05, 2001 and **further informed me that the March 16, 2001 is not filed.** The same is attached as **Mo. Ex 09. This statement is proven false by the " FILED" stamp on Exhibit No. 11.**

35) On May 12, 2001, I wrote another detailed letter, disagreeing with CA2NY Clerk's office and it is attache as **Mo. Ex. 10.**

36) I have not received any explanation, from CA2NY clerk's office.

37) On May 18, I received an Order of the Court, in the Rubin & Rothman matter [Docket No. 00-7751] declining my request, for En Banc hearing, for the stated reasons. Same is attached as **Mo. Ex. 11.**

38) I "treat the Form Letter with faded print- as the RESPONSE, FROM THE CLERK'S OFFICE" to my letter of May 12, 2001 **as the " CLERK'S FINAL ANSWER" and retaliation, for my writing letters, to the Clerk's office.**

39) Now, I have received another denial, dated May 30, 2001; under signature of Beth J. Meador, in the name of the Court, denying my Motion of March 16, 2001. The same is attached as **Mo. Ex.12.**

40) Still there is no "reason offered" for denying my motion.

41) Exhibit Mo. Ex.12 shows that, my Motion was received and filed in the Court on March 19, 2001 and therefore the statements of Beth J. Meador to the effect that :

1) my file is closed [Mo. Ex. 05] and

2) that the March 16, 2001 motion " is not filed" in [Mo. Ex.09]

are not just inaccurate but are totally false, deceptive, misleading and knowingly "so" made, to deny constitutional justice to me. The statements of Ms. Meador are in violation of Oath Of Office, offensive to the Constitution and *"in effect"* deny me Due Process Of Law, guaranteed under the Fifth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

42) This appellant is proceeding to file Petition to the United States Supreme Court, for necessary relief, on Constitutional grounds.

43) Now, the defendants MacCartney, et al have demanded that I pay them the "amount the Mandated" to them. The letter is attached as **Mo. Ex 13.**

44) The Mandate is in violation of Local Rule 41(1), since this case was **NEVER decided in "Open Court"** either by a Jury in District Court, nor by a "Bench Trial" in the District Court, nor a Decision was "announced by this Court, in Open Court, at any time.

45) My letters to Beth J. Meador Mo. Ex 06, Mo. Ex 08, Mo. Ex 10 offer some of the arguments, in support of this Motion.

46) I am confident that I will prevail in the United States

Supreme Court-on account of the fact, I will raise the following issues:

A) That I have been discriminated in the Judicial Proceeding in Lower Courts.

B) That the Lower Courts have refused and failed to "enforce" the laws, upon my invoking their jurisdiction.

C) That the Lower Courts have violated the "Congressional Mandate" and have refused to Follow the Decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court.

D) That Common Law cannot "invalidate U. S. Constitution and Laws of United States" and hence Common Law Immunity is Unconstitutional.

E) That the Civil Rights statutes are silent as to the application of " *Time limitations"*-for their violations and to file claims for Civil Damages. Since U. S. Congress never enacted "any time limitations"during the 130 years of passing the first Civil Rights Statutes and that it is proper to borrow from N. Y. State Statutes for defendant's violating my rights by engaging in Frauds and conspiracies, resulting in their violating my rights under the 14th Amendment of The U. S. Constitution. Therefore provisions under NY CPLR 213 must be applied.

F) That RICO *statute* does not limit it's

applications to "Commercial Injury" only in Civil Cases nor RICO statute require violations of *each element of* 18 USCS 1962 (a),(b) and (c) for making a Civil damage claim, under RICO.

G) That interpretations of "Rights and Property" as determined by the U. S. Supreme Court must be applied.

H) Invoke the "Supervisory Power" of the U. S. Supreme Court, on account of the refusal and failure of the Lower Courts, to abide by the principles and procedures laid down by the U. S. Supreme Court.

I) Since only a "Judge" constitutes "lawful judicial authority", why any "decision or order" not signed by the "Judges Of The Court" is to be treated as a constitutional "judicial decision".

WHEREFORE, your deponent, respectfully brings the entire matter to the attention of this Court and request this Court to take notice of the following:

A) The proceeding for your deponent in this Court have turned out to be "meaningless and futile exercise", have been total violation of Due Process Guarantee under the Fifth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution by reason of discrimination and disregard to my case, in violation of the Law Of The Land.

B) The decisions, under the signatures of Beth J. Meador

or others, purported to be in the name of the Judges of this Court are suspect, are without any authority, in violation of several U. S. Statutes, offensive and subversive to (of) the U. S. Constitution.

C) False statements have been made by the employee [who is also an attorney] of this Court [that is part of the U. S. Government] in writing, in violation of 18 USC 1001 and that one or more than one person of this Court's personnel **"responsible to present the papers to the Judicial Authorities [The Judges]"** have failed to present them in timely manner or to present the papers, at all and therefore violated 18 USC 1512.

D) Such highly prejudicial and unauthorized conduct directed towards this litigant, by the employees of this Court is unconstitutional.

E) That the personnel in this Court have conducted themselves beyond their authority, have taken decisions in the name of or under falsely assumed or usurped "Judicial" authority of this Court, [that such persons do not possess], under the constitutional scheme and by "so doing" have tainted and or polluted "jurisprudence" of this Court.

F) That, while this Pro Se litigant has been prosecuting his Civil Litigations, through constitutionally protected process, he has been subjected to unconstitutional, prejudicial and discriminating treatment.

G) Therefore may I respectfully request, that, 1) The mandate be vacated as being in violation of the

Statutes and therefore it is unconstitutional **2)** stay the mandate, since this appellant is proceeding to file his petitions for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

H) Such relief was requested on March 16, 2001 but the letters of Beth J. Meador have now offered complete and unequivocal proof of the discrimination, falsification, deception and unconstitutional conduct, that calls for Re-Filing of this request.

I) In view of this presentation, your deponent requests that the Mandate be vacated, without any reservations, whatsoever.

J) Kindly grant such other relief, that the Court deems Prudent, Just and proper and require to dispense under the Constitutional Scheme and authority.

Spring Valley, NY

Date: July 02, 2001

Ashok Kashelkar
Appellant Pro Se
6 Innington Court
Spring Valley NY 10977
Tel: (845) 426 2902

Notary:
Sd_____
Jill Rothbaum
Notary Public State Of New York
No. 44-4757575
Qualified in Rockland County
Commission Expires on March 30, 2002

Following is the List Of Exhibits, attached to the above Motion. Most of the Exhibits, are "reproduced" in Appendixes B & C and their page references in Appendixes are, provided hereunder.

However, the Postal Receipts of my mailing the En Banc Petitions [Mo-Ex-1-A] and CA2NY envelope copy showing the March 12, 2001 [MO-Ex-2], are appended hereafter, for their authenticity and difficulty in acceptable reproduction

---

Exhibit List & References

The Page references are to pages in Appendixes "B & C"

MO-Ex 1	Feb. 09, 2001-CA2NY denial of my Timely filed Petition for Panel Rehearing, in MacCartney matter	**B-11**
MO-Ex 1-A	Proof of Mailing [Postal Receipts] Petition for En Banc Hearing, in both the cases [This cannot be reproduced and hence copies are appended hereto]	**Attached**
MO-Ex- 2	March 09, 2001 decision of CA2NY, mailed on March 12, 2001, denying my request, for extension of time to file En Banc Petition, in MacCartney matter	**B-13**
	Copy of the Envelope of CA2NY, showing March 12, 2001 mailing [This was attached, with Motion of May 16, 2001[C-34]	**Attached**
MO-Ex-3	Feb. 09, 2001-CA2NY denial of my Timely filed Petition for Panel Rehearing, in Rubin & Rothman matter	**B-50**
MO-Ex-4	April 06, 2001 CA2NY granting my motion for File En Banc hearing in Rubin & Rothman matter	**B-51**
MO-Ex-5	April 06, 2001 letter, under signature of Beth Meador, returning my March 24, 2001	**C-48**

	motion, without it's filing in the record or submitting to the Court	
MO-Ex-6	My letter to the Clerk's office-dated April 17, 2001	**C-49**
MO-Ex-7	April 26, 2001 letter from Beth Meador	**C-57**
MO-Ex-8	My letter to Beth Meador, dated May 05, 2001	**C-59**
MO-Ex-9	May 07, 2001 letter from Beth Meador	**C- 63**
MO-Ex-10	My letter to Beth Meador, dated May 12, 2001	**C-64**
MO-Ex-11	CA2NY order, dated May 16, 2001; denying my En Banc Petition, under signature of Beth J. Meador	**B-52**
MO-Ex-12	CA2NY order, dated May 31, 2001; denying my March 16, 2001 Motion, under signature of Beth J. Meador	**B-18**
MO-Ex-13	Letter from MacCartneys, demanding the "mandated" amount of $ 405.94, dated June 25, 2001... This letter is not appended, in this appendix but is part of the Motion submitted to CA2NY	

Prepared and submitted by:

Ashok Kashelkar
Appellant Pro Se
6 Innington Court
Spring Valley NY 10977
Tel: (845) 426 2902

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

***** WELCOME TO *****
MONSEY
MONSEY, NY 10952-9998
03/09/01 04:17PM

Store USPS Trans 54
Wkstn sys5007 Cashier KM204Z
Cashier's Name FRED
Stock Unit Id WINFRED
PO Phone Number 914-356-3735

1. Priority Mail 3.90
Destination: 11747
Weight: 6.00oz
Postage Type: PVI
Total Cost: 3.90
Base Rate: 3.50
SERVICES
Deliv. Confirmation 0.40
Label#: 03047990000097649683

2. Priority Mail 3.90
Destination: 10271
Weight: 6.00oz
Postage Type: PVI
Total Cost: 3.90
Base Rate: 3.50
SERVICES
Deliv. Confirmation 0.40
Label#: 03047990000097649652

3. Priority Mail 3.90
Destination: 10005
Weight: 6.20oz
Postage Type: PVI
Total Cost: 3.90
Base Rate: 3.50
SERVICES
Deliv. Confirmation 0.40
Label#: 03047990000097649669

4. Priority Mail 3.90
Destination: 10960
Weight: 6.10oz
Postage Type: PVI
Total Cost: 3.90
Base Rate: 3.50
SERVICES
Deliv. Confirmation 0.40
Label#: 03047990000097649676

5. Priority Mail 8.65
Destination: 10007
Weight: 6lb 4.50oz
Postage Type: PVI
Total Cost: 8.65
Base Rate: 8.25
SERVICES
Deliv. Confirmation 0.40
Label#: 03047990000097649645

Subtotal 24.25
Total 24.25

Cash 30.00
Change Due
Cash 5.75

Number of Items Sold: 5

Thank You
Please come again!

Kinko's (845) 735-0143
111 E. Route 59
Nanuet, NY 10954-2911

QTY/LIST	DISC	PRICE	AMOUNT
750 ES B&W S/S WHITE STD			
0.09	0.00	0.09	67.50

SUB 67.50 TX 4.89 TOT 72.39
Visa 72.39
CHG 0.00

XXXXXXXXXXXX4959 08/01 AP046975
I agree to pay the above amount
according to the card issuer agreement.
Sign Here: X_____

CH# 69.TR 40432 RG 4 03/08/01 23:32
Visit us @ http://www.kinkos.com

U.S. Postal Service Delivery Confirmation Receipt

Postage and Delivery Confirmation fees must be paid before mailing.

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION NUMBER: 0304 7990 0000 9764 9645

Office Of Clerk
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Second Circuit
Foley Square, New York NY 10007

POSTAL CUSTOMER:
Keep this receipt. For inquiries: Access internet web site at www.usps.com or call 1-800-222-1811

Postmark Here
USPS MONSEY NY 10952 MAR 9 2001

CHECK ONE (POSTAL USE ONLY)
☑ Priority Mail
☐ Standard Mail (B)

PS Form 152, March 1999 (See Reverse)

U.S. Postal Service Delivery Confirmation Receipt

Postage and Delivery Confirmation fees must be paid before mailing.

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION NUMBER: 0304 7990 0000 9764 9669

Article
Joseph Gershman, ESQ
Cahill, Gordon & Reindel
80 Pine Street
New York NY 10005

POSTAL CUSTOMER:
Keep this receipt. For inquiries: Access internet web site at www.usps.com or call 1-800-222-1811

Postmark Here
USPS MONSEY NY 10952 MAR 9 2001

CHECK ONE (POSTAL USE ONLY)
☑ Priority Mail
☐ Standard Mail (B)

PS Form 152, March 1999 (See Reverse)

U.S. Postal Service Delivery Confirmation Receipt

Postage and Delivery Confirmation fees must be paid before mailing.

Article Sent To: (to be completed by mailer)

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION NUMBER: 0304 7990 0000 9764 9683

Stallone & Garcia, ESQ
135 Pine Lawn Road- Suite 220 N
Melville NY 11747

Keep this receipt. For inquiries: Access internet web site at www.usps.com or call 1-800-222-1811

Postmark Here
USPS MONSEY NY 10952 MAR 9 2001

CHECK ONE (POSTAL USE ONLY)
☑ Priority Mail
☐ Standard Mail (B)

PS Form 152, March 1999 (See Reverse)

U.S. Postal Service Delivery Confirmation Receipt

Postage and Delivery Confirmation fees must be paid before mailing.

Article Sent To: (to be completed by mailer)

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION NUMBER: 0304 7990 0000 9764 9676

MacCartney, MacCartney, Kerrigan & MacCartney
13 North Broadway
Nyack, NY 10960

POSTAL CUSTOMER:
Keep this receipt. For inquiries: Access internet web site at www.usps.com or call 1-800-222-1811

Postmark Here
USPS MONSEY NY 10952 MAR 9 2001

CHECK ONE (POSTAL USE ONLY)
☑ Priority Mail
☐ Standard Mail (B)

PS Form 152, March 1999 (See Reverse)

U.S. Postal Service Delivery Confirmation Receipt

Postage and Delivery Confirmation fees must be paid before mailing.

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION NUMBER: 0304 7990 0000 9764 9652

Attorney General O The State Of New York
Charles F. Sanders, Asst. Atty Gen
120 Broadway
New York 10271

POSTAL CUSTOMER:
Keep this receipt. For inquiries: Access internet web site at www.usps.com or call 1-800-222-1811

Postmark Here
USPS MONSEY NY 10952 MAR 9 2001

CHECK ONE (POSTAL USE ONLY)
☑ Priority Mail
☐ Standard Mail (B)

PS Form 152, March 1999 (See Reverse)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CLERK'S OFFICE
TED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
FOLEY SQUARE
NEW YORK, NY 10007

NEW YORK
JAN 17 0
NY

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE $300
PB METER 7251087
$.55
U.S. POSTAGE

Ashok Kashelkar
6 Innington Court
Spring Valley, NY 10977